



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,194	07/19/2001	Michael A. Wilkman	HOLCORP.005A	9144
20995	7590	12/15/2005	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			CHAMPAGNE, DONALD	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA 92614			3622	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/909,194

Applicant(s)

WILKMAN, MICHAEL A.

Examiner

Donald L. Champagne

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-13,15 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-13, 15 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed with an amendment on 22 September 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments are addressed at para. 6-9 below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 11-13, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Deaton et al. (US005644723A).
5. Deaton et al. teaches (independent claims 1 and 8) a system and method for managing promotions, including the matching of at least one of a plurality of promotions with at least one of a plurality of users, the method comprising: entering coupon configurations in the *Table 7* database (col. 108 lines 19-20, where *Table 7* begins at col. 131), which reads on receiving, via an electronic communications medium, a plurality of promotions relating to a plurality of merchants, where a *multiple stores* (col. 77 lines 50-62) reads on a plurality of merchants; receiving, via an electronic communications medium (*the POS terminals 962A-E*, col. 77 line 8) user information relating to a plurality of *customers/users*, wherein the *customer/user* information includes *customer/user* account information (col. 78 lines 2-8 and col. 80 lines 1-10); targeting promotions based on the *customer/user* shopping history (col. 78 lines 59-62), which reads on matching at least one of the plurality of promotions (col. 75

Art Unit: 3622

lines 16-18) to at least one of the plurality of *customers/users* based at least upon a portion of the plurality of *customer/user* information and user account information; and presenting to at least one of the plurality of *customers/users* information in a promotion document (a *printed coupon*, col. 80 lines 10-11) about the at least one of the plurality of promotions. For claim 1, the *customer/user* shopping history reads on preferences that correspond to the user.

6. Also concerning claim 1, Deaton et al. also teaches a transaction processor 110 (col. 10 line 66, Fig. 1, and col. 4 line 61 to col. 5 line 24) in *remote transaction procession system 110* (col. 20 line 56 to col. 21 line 31), which reads on a user module and a transaction module. (The processor in *host system 110* reads on the merchant management module.) In particular, the transaction module is configured to select at least one of the plurality of user accounts to use for a commercial transaction (the one account selected by the user) with the at least one of a plurality of merchants (whichever one merchant the user has chosen to do business with) wherein the selection (made by the user) is based at least in part on comparing predetermined rules that govern use of the plurality of user accounts and the at least one promotion.
7. Applicant argues (pp. 5-6) that the reference does not teach the new limitation to claim 1. The examiner disagrees (para. 6 above).
8. Applicant argues (p. 6, "Regarding claim 8"), in effect, that there is a distinction between "user information" and "user account information". This is illogical because lines 6-7 of claim 8 are limited to "wherein the user information includes user account information". For applicant's future benefit, the examiner looked for a basis in the spec. to distinguish between "user information" and "user account information". No basis was found because the terms are not given a "clear definition" in the spec.
9. Note on interpretation of claim terms Unless a term is given a "clear definition" in the specification (MPEP § 2111.01), the examiner is obligated to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, in light of the specification, and consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach (MPEP § 2111). An inventor may define specific terms used to describe invention, but must do so "with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision" (MPEP § 2111.01.III). A "clear definition" must establish the metes and bounds of the terms. A clear definition must unambiguously establish what is and what is

Art Unit: 3622

not included. A clear definition is indicated by a section labeled definitions, or by the use of phrases such as "by xxx we mean"; "xxx is defined as"; or "xxx includes, ... but does not include ...". The instant application contains no such clear definition for the terms "user information" and "user account information".

10. Deaton et al. also teaches at the citations given above claims 2 (where connecting said *multiple stores*, col. 77 lines 50-62, reads on registering a plurality of merchants), 2-6, 11 (the designated activity is shopping), 12, 13 and 19. Deaton et al. also teaches claim 15 (col. 78 lines 2-8).
11. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Deaton et al. in view of Leatherman et al. (US006052629A). Deaton et al. does not teach an interactive, audio and video promotion document (where a promotion reads on an ad). Leatherman et al. teaches an interactive, audio and video promotion document ((col. 5 lines 13-26). Because Leatherman et al. teaches that such a POS interface would have many commercial advantages (col. 1 line 5 to col. 2 line 33), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the teachings of Leatherman et al. to those of Deaton et al.

Possibility of Allowable Subject Matter

12. The examiner searched the spec. for disclosed limitations that would overcome the prior art made of record, and therefore might make the instant invention patentable. The spec. does disclose a "personal computer", which the examiner would interpret to include any computer personally owned or used by a consumer/customer, including a PDA, cell phone or smart card. The instant rejection could be overcome by amending claim 1 with "personal computer" replacing "user module", and by introducing the use of a "personal computer" to claim 8.
13. Applicant is cautioned that an allowance could not be considered until this or any other amendment was searched.

Conclusion

14. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09909194. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
15. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L Champagne whose telephone number is 571-272-6717. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 5 PM ET, Monday to Thursday. The examiner can also be contacted by e-mail at donald.champagne@uspto.gov, and *informal* fax communications (i.e., communications not to be made of record) may be sent directly to the examiner at 571-273-6717.
17. The examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 571-272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3622

19. **AFTER FINAL PRACTICE** – Consistent with MPEP § 706.07(f) and 713.09, prosecution generally ends with the final rejection. Examiner will grant an interview after final only when applicant presents compelling evidence that “disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration” (MPEP § 713.09). The burden is on applicant to demonstrate this requirement, preferably in no more than 25 words. Amendments are entered after final only when the amendments will clearly simplify issues, or put the case into condition for allowance, clearly and without additional search or more than nominal consideration.
20. Applicant may have after final arguments considered and amendments entered by filing an RCE.
21. **ABANDONMENT** – If examiner cannot by telephone verify applicant’s intent to continue prosecution, the application is subject to abandonment six months after mailing of the last Office action. The agent, attorney or applicant point of contact is responsible for assuring that the Office has their telephone number. Agents and attorneys may verify their registration information including telephone number at the Office’s web site, www.uspto.gov. At the top of the home page, click on Site Index. Then click on Agent & Attorney Roster in the alphabetic list, and search for your registration by your name or number.

6 December 2005

DONALD L. CHAMPAGNE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Donald L. Champagne
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622